

Date: Fri, 21 Oct 94 04:30:22 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #497  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 21 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 497

Today's Topics:

ARRL salaries (Was: ARRL Dues(Or why pay em?))  
CW QSO Content  
Even a blind pig finds an acorn now and then  
license tests  
New callsign cost?  
Packet on CB Freq??

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Thu, 20 Oct 1994 19:29:44 GMT  
From: alanb@hpnmarb.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom)  
Subject: ARRL salaries (Was: ARRL Dues(Or why pay em?))

Steve Wilson (steve@sheridan.ncd.com) wrote:

: In article <37va9s\$b6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

: >Dr. Michael Mancini (mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:

: >

: >: The League has welcomed these "new" amateurs with open arms. And why not?  
: >: At \$30 a head, they represent some serious cash flow. Even though the  
: >: League is a non-profit organization, most of the officers at Newington  
: >: still draw handsome salaries.

: First off, the current membership dues covers only about 30% of the operating  
: costs, this includes publishing QST and all of the other league  
: activities(both publishing and field programs). The vast majority of

: league expenses are covered by the publishing operation profits!

: ... all of the elected officers of ARRL, i.e. Directors,  
: Section Managers, as well as the VP's and President(with the notable exception  
: of the Mr. Sumner) receive NO pay. The staff folks are compensated for their  
: efforts, but the pay scale isn't comparable to industry(at least not in my  
: part of the country...) by a large margin!

A friend of mine reportedly took a \$10k per year pay cut when he quit his  
job in industry and went to work for ARRL. When I worked there in the  
mid-70's my starting salary was \$500/month as a W1AW operator. I have heard  
that pay scales are better there now, but still well below industry averages.

AL N1AL

-----

Date: 20 Oct 1994 23:37:47 GMT  
From: mconner@rain.atms.purdue.edu (Mark D. Conner)  
Subject: CW QSO Content

In article <386jn3\$1cn@owl.csr.vt.edu> cross901@raven.csr.vt.edu (Rich  
Crossler) writes:

>I believe that the morse should still be required, just to expose hams to  
>it. The number of hams on CW would decrease gradually, until CW would  
>hardly be used by American hams.

This is considered a problem? :)

RTTY seems to be alive and well, despite being superseded by AMTOR,  
and there's not even a mode-specific test for it. I think Morse can hold  
its own against the other modes if the test were dropped, though  
usage might decrease and the phone bands will get more crowded.

Let Morse stand or fall on its own merits. If it's a superior or popular  
mode, it will live long after significant use outside Amateur Radio  
goes away and long after testing for it is no longer required for use  
of the HF bands. If it's not, it'll die a natural death from disuse.

If manual Morse coding is so superior, why can't it be a mode just  
like any other mode? Digital modes require a significant investment  
of time and effort to learn the various networking methods, encoding  
schemes, etc., in order to exploit the mode fully, yet amateurs do  
this all the time without complaint. They will also do so for manual  
Morse on HF if the benefits are deemed worth the effort required.

>Changing the code requirements would just make the FCC slower in

>distributing licenses anyway.

How so? The VE says you passed the testing for whatever class. What that testing is is not relevant to those processing the licenses at Gettysburg - all they see is a form that Joe Blow is qualified for General now. They don't care if the requirement is 13wpm manual Morse decoding or bird identification.

--

Mark D. Conner - N9XTN                      Opinions expressed here are  
Dept. of Earth & Atmospheric Sciences not necessarily those of the  
Purdue Univ., W. Lafayette IN 47907      Government, DoD, Purdue, or  
mconner@rain.atms.purdue.edu              the author.

-----

Date: Thu, 20 Oct 1994 11:59:48 GMT  
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject: Even a blind pig finds an acorn now and then

In article <CxyIn2.LMM@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:

>I am taking the liberty of reposting Dave's article from .misc,  
>for his article contains several good points (I especially like  
>the last paragraph!).

>

>Jeff NH6IL

>From: djenkins@jetson.uh.edu (David Jenkins)

>

>You know, I \*swore\* that I wouldn't like CW, that it was anachronistic  
>and technically obsolete. All that notwithstanding, I think it's going  
>to be a helluva lot of fun! I have a borrowed QRP rig, an antenna, and a  
>desire to communicate--all advice is appreciated...

I think most of us would admit that some people find manual Morse operation fun. That still doesn't justify making it a \*test\* element. If there weren't a manual Morse test element, David could have still gotten on the mode and found it fun, and probably months earlier. The test element is an artificial barrier to getting on the air in manual Morse mode, or other modes, on HF.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----  
Date: 20 Oct 94 17:51:49 PDT  
From: tbear@kaster.cts.com (Tbear)  
Subject: license tests

IMHO there should be

1. code proficiency tests ( 50% will whine & moan )
2. Speech / Diction tests ( maine & SE states will bitch ) texans too :)
3. Typing tests ( packet, rtty and other dweebs will fuss )
4. Photogenic appraisals ( no uglies on ATV ! )

There should not be any form of written test. After all we can look up any information we need in the plethora of ham radio books we have. Or we can post our questions on an internet newsgroup over and over and over and over..... And we can re hash the same topic(s) over and over and over..... And the same people can flame each other over and over and over.....

73 KE6LZS Lou Wasmund tbear@kaster.cts.com

... We now return to our regularly scheduled flame-throwing.

\_\_\_ Blue Wave/QWK v2.12

-----  
Date: 20 Oct 1994 11:32:12 GMT  
From: fa419@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (Mike Staples)  
Subject: New callsign cost?

I understand that there is a fee for changing an existing call sign to a 'personalized' version. Is there a fee for a change of callsign if you just want to upgrade it to reflect your current license grade?

TNX!

Mike

-----  
Date: Thu, 20 Oct 1994 11:50:08 GMT  
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject: Packet on CB Freq??

In article <n7slx.5.00231963@primenet.com> n7slx@primenet.com (John Mitchell) writes:

>I heard packet on a local CB channel, is it legal to operate packet on these

>freq??

Not in the USA, but it is legal in some European countries.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: 20 Oct 1994 13:31:11 GMT

From: wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner)

References<37kfob\$P4k@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> <RFM.94Oct17113936@urth.eng.sun.com>,  
<384r4i\$ir8@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>

Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

In article <384r4i\$ir8@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

>Dana, membership in the ARRL (a non-profit organization) and purchasing  
>a paperback novel (a profit venture) are two entirely different things.  
>But since that idea seems to appeal to you, the Timex watch I now wear  
>costs LESS than the exact same model did 15 years ago. A Radio Shack  
>TRS-80 computer, with external hard drive and floppy would set you  
>back nearly \$10,000 in 1980. Now, you can buy a superior computer  
>with more memory, a larger hard drive and a larger floppy drive for  
>under \$600. Need I go on?

Robert, it seems you still have a few problems with economics.  
Everything you mention was relatively new technology back then, while  
much more common today. More people buy them (much, much more) now than  
way back when. Thus prices go down.

Books--and ARRL membership--on the other hand aren't in the same boat.  
There has not been the same kind of increase in people buy them. Books  
have been common for a \*long\* time, and the ARRL hasn't gotten that many  
new members.

I'm sure you can find reasons why it is still inappropriate to compare  
books and the ARRL, but it is still (in some respects) better than what  
you suggest.

-----

Date: Thu, 20 Oct 1994 12:08:43 GMT  
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<782497263snz@g4kfk.demon.co.uk>  
<1994Oct19.113659.11823@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CxyJC0.Lvx@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject: Re: Kindness and ham radio

In article <CxyJC0.Lvx@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:  
>gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>.....

>>I fail to see why you should complain if stations want to exchange  
>>QSL cards to acknowledge an unusual contact made through a repeater.  
>>They may prize it as much as you do your score tokens.

>

>Hey Gary, why is it that here on .policy you condemn HF ops who exchange  
>QSL cards by calling them 'post card collectors' yet on .misc it's FB to  
>exchange them for DX repeater contacts?

Because DXers collect them for \*score\*, IE they aren't interested  
in the card or the person they contacted, only in counting coup.  
The folks exchanging cards for repeater contacts aren't going for  
score, repeater contacts don't count in DX games, they're just using  
the card for it's original purpose, as a memento of a communication  
with another person.

I object to the gaming, and the corruption of the original purposes  
of the QSL card, not the exchange of QSL cards per se.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: 20 Oct 1994 18:58:13 GMT  
From: Brian Suggs <suggs@tcville.es.hac.com>

References<Pine.SUN.3.90.941013201616.10536A-1000000@access1.digex.net>  
<37tu6b\$qlb@hacgate2.hac.com>,  
<Pine.SUN.3.90.941019004501.1737E-1000000@access1.digex.net>  
Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAI

> The issues that were addressed in the questionnaire have been beaten to  
> death, but I had no problem with discussing them further. However, my

> objection was the targeting of the questionnaire itself, apparently  
> because some people didn't understanding its purpose.

> I understand now that it was a mistake to post it here. The concept is  
> apparently a bit too complex for this forum.

I understand that the main purpose of your posting was to supply the questions to the voters in a particular division. That fact does not mean that others who have valid comments and criticism shouldn't air their opinions. Your objections are sounding like you would prefer to keep such criticism from those voters. Is this the case, Tony?

Yes, the particular issue continues to be beaten to death, but that is because so many people try to assume that two different issues are the same. They are not. Apparently that is too complex for you. (to return your cheap shot)

Brian

-----

Date: 20 Oct 1994 18:37:23 -0500  
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<38473j\$p8v\$1@rosebud.ncd.com> <384rst\$j32@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<3869ul\$c4j@wrdis02.robins.af.mil>  
Subject: Re: ARRL Dues(Or why pay em?)

In article <3869ul\$c4j@wrdis02.robins.af.mil>,  
Larry CONTRACTOR Keith Mr. <lakeith@robins.af.mil> wrote:

>amateur radio. If you want the same representation (and the same  
>right to bitch about it!), I invite you to join the ARRL.

I'm considering it as we speak, Larry.

-----

Date: 19 Oct 1994 23:32:29 -0500  
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<19940ct17.194607.27017@arrl.org> <37va9s\$b6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<38473j\$p8v\$1@rosebud.ncd.com>  
Subject: Re: ARRL Dues(Or why pay em?)

In article <38473j\$p8v\$1@rosebud.ncd.com>,  
Steve Wilson <steve@sheridan.ncd.com> wrote:  
>In article <37va9s\$b6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael

Mancini) writes:

>|> In article <1994Oct17.194607.27017@arrl.org>,

>|> Ed Hare (KA1CV) <ehare@arrl.org> wrote:

>|> >Dr. Michael Mancini (mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:

>|> >

>|> >: The League has welcomed these "new" amateurs with open arms. And why not?

>|> >: At \$30 a head, they represent some serious cash flow. Even though the

>|> >: League is a non-profit organization, most of the officers at Newington

>|> >: still draw handsome salaries.

>|> >

>|> >Believe what you will, but when I "welcome them with open arms" it is because

>|> >I believe that ARRL needs to represent all of Amateur Radio or we will lose

>|> >our effectiveness to represent any of it.

>

[stuff deleted]

>|> Yes, I agree that the ARRL needs to represent "all" of amateur radio, but

>|> the truth is that it doesn't. Rather, it usually represents the majority

>|> of its membership, and often the League just represents the League.

>|>

>|> Case in point: I was recently at a convention, in which I asked one of the

>|> League Directors a few questions. His first response to me was an inquiry

>|> as to whether I was a League member or not. When I said no, he promptly

>|> told me to stop wasting his time.

>

>Well, from his perspective as a politician that makes alot of sense. And from

>my perspective as a member, why should you get the benefits of influencing the

>decision making in an organization you aren't a member of. You receive many

>of the fringe benefits of league operations for free...while I shoulder the

>burden of paying for it. Why should someone who is free-loading have political

>influence. No...I don't agree with you here. Pay the tab or don't take

>the cab!

Now, let me get this straight. Ed Hare just stated that "I believe the ARRL need to respresent all of amateur radio or we will lose our effectiveness to represent any of it." Whereas, you tell me that the League should only represent its paid-in-full membership. I wonder which is the official League policy.

-----

Date: Thu, 20 Oct 1994 22:30:42 GMT

From: barron@rmc.liant.com (Robert Barron)

References<37kfob\$4k@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> <RFM.940ct17113936@urth.eng.sun.com>,  
<384r4i\$1r8@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>

Reply-To: barron@rmc.liant.com

Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE



In <384r4i\$ir8@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

>Dana, membership in the ARRL (a non-profit organization) and purchasing  
>a paperback novel (a profit venture) are two entirely different things.  
>But since that idea seems to appeal to you, the Timex watch I now wear  
>costs LESS than the exact same model did 15 years ago. A Radio Shack  
>TRS-80 computer, with external hard drive and floppy would set you  
>back nearly \$10,000 in 1980. Now, you can buy a superior computer  
>with more memory, a larger hard drive and a larger floppy drive for  
>under \$600. Need I go on?

Please don't! If the ARRL only had computer expenses they might very well be able to lower prices. However this is the real world and computer costs are only a fraction of total costs. Postage is up, taxes are up, salaries are up, electricity rates are up, cost of living is up, paper prices are up, need I go on?

73,

Robert KA5WSS  
barron@rmc.liant.com

-----  
Date: 19 Oct 1994 23:19:30 -0500  
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<1994Oct13.142836.22507@lpi.liant.com> <37kfob\$p4k@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<RFM.94Oct17113936@urth.eng.sun.com>  
Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

In article <RFM.94Oct17113936@urth.eng.sun.com>,  
Richard McAllister <rfm@urth.eng.sun.com> wrote:  
>In article <37kfob\$p4k@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

>  
>>When I got into this game back in the mid-Seventies, ARRL membership  
>>(with QST) was \$7.50 a year. Now (last I heard) it is \$30.00.  
>  
>Robert, could you come up with some new ideas instead of just new names?  
>In the mid seventies a typical paperback book was \$1.25; now it's \$5.  
>The very same 4:1 ratio.

Dana, membership in the ARRL (a non-profit organization) and purchasing a paperback novel (a profit venture) are two entirely different things. But since that idea seems to appeal to you, the Timex watch I now wear costs LESS than the exact same model did 15 years ago. A Radio Shack

TRS-80 computer, with external hard drive and floppy would set you back nearly \$10,000 in 1980. Now, you can buy a superior computer with more memory, a larger hard drive and a larger floppy drive for under \$600. Need I go on?

-----  
Date: 20 Oct 1994 20:25:07 GMT  
From: cross901@raven.csr.vt.edu (Rich Crossler)

References<CxAGw6.BIE@news.hawaii.edu> <37c5ak\$4mp@chnews.intel.com>,  
<37dapa\$ksr@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

I believe that the morse should still be required, just to expose hams to it. The number of hams on CW would decrease gradually, until CW would hardly be used by American hams.

I have a lot of interest in CW, even though I only have a Tech. license. It is my goal to go all the way through the ranks to Extra, and I plan on being able to pass the code test.

Changing the code requirements would just make the FCC slower in distributing licenses anyway.

Thanks for your time and bandwidth.

Rich Crossler  
KC7CIY

-----  
Date: Thu, 20 Oct 94 23:54:57 GMT  
From: kevin@sparc.SanDiegoCA.ncr.com (Kevin Sanders)

References<37n7sg\$3n9@crcnis1.unl.edu> <37nsh7\$ncm@chnews.intel.com>,  
<37ok4i\$bc8@gti.gti.net>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <37ok4i\$bc8@gti.gti.net> wb2mpk@gti.gti.net (Glen Johnson) writes:  
>

>I view code testing as an irrelevant obstacle to upgrading. I wanted an  
>Extra class license, so I knew what I had to do to get it, and I did it,  
>but I do consider it a waste of my time. Today, if you're a codeless

That's real interesting, why on earth would you want an Extra class license

and at the same time consider learning Morse a waste of time? The Extra class grants you the bottom 25 KHz of some of the bands, which is used exclusively by CW ops. What's your motivation to get your Extra if not CW operation in the "DX" subband? Considering how valuable your time must be, I'm sure you don't waste it accumulating wallpaper (\*including\* your Extra license, if you don't use its privileges).

>

>Alternatively, I would support Morse testing if what you got for passing  
>a code test was CW privileges in the bands. Maybe you shouldn't be

See above. That's what 20WPM test is for.

--

Kevin Sanders	Voice: (619) 485-3972
AT&T Global Information Solutions	FAX: (619) 485-XXXX
17095 Via Del Campo	Email: kevin@sparc.SanDiegoCA.ncr.com
San Diego, CA 92127	

-----

Date: 20 Oct 1994 17:38:29 GMT  
From: lakeith@robins.af.mil ( Larry CONTRACTOR Keith Mr.)

References<37va9s\$b6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> <38473j\$8v\$1@rosebud.ncd.com>,  
<384rst\$j32@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>  
Subject: Re: ARRL Dues(Or why pay em?)

Dr. Michael Mancini (mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:  
: In article <38473j\$8v\$1@rosebud.ncd.com>,  
: Steve Wilson <steve@sheridan.ncd.com> wrote:  
: >In article <37va9s\$b6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr.  
Michael Mancini) writes:  
: >|> In article <1994Oct17.194607.27017@arrl.org>,  
: >|> Ed Hare (KA1CV) <ehare@arrl.org> wrote:  
: >|> >Dr. Michael Mancini (mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:  
: >|> >\_\_\_\_\_stuff deleted\_\_\_\_\_

: >|>  
: >|> Case in point: I was recently at a convention, in which I asked one of the  
: >|> League Directors a few questions. His first response to me was an inquiry  
: >|> as to whether I was a League member or not. When I said no, he promptly  
: >|> told me to stop wasting his time.

That's enough to make me want to pay the \$30 per year just so I could  
vote against him in the next election.

In fairness to this elected official, I can appreciate the fact

that he would rather spend his time serving those individuals who support the organization. But, I feel that his answer to you was not in the best interests of our organization. If he had stopped to answer your question, maybe he could have interested you in becoming a League member.

: Now, let me get this straight. Ed Hare just stated that "I believe the ARRL  
: need to represent all of amateur radio or we will lose our effectiveness to  
: represent any of it." Whereas, you tell me that the League should only  
: represent its paid-in-full membership. I wonder which is the official  
: League policy.

First, let's remember that Ed is a paid employee of the League. His beliefs are not League policy. I happen to agree with his statement. But, the practical application of that belief is not as easy as one would think.

Any ARRL representative who claimed to represent "all of amateur radio" could immediately be challenged to substantiate that claim. What is his answer? His organization's membership is not a majority of licensed hams and he has no valid right to make such a claim. It is as simple as that.

If we want the ARRL to represent all of amateur radio, let's make it a fact instead of an attitude. I think the elected officials have the attitude, when it is required. But, they also know that they are on shaky ground, if someone asks questions.

All amateurs, ARRL members or not, benefit from the fact that there is an American Radio Relay League. I believe that by representing me, the dues paying member, that they do represent what is best for amateur radio. If you want the same representation (and the same right to bitch about it!), I invite you to join the ARRL.

73,

Larry Keith, KQ4BY

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #497

\*\*\*\*\*